

CANDOUR

*The British
Views - Letter*

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol XLII Nos 11/12

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper

November/December 1990

Warm wishes for a
Holy Christmas Season



In Nativitate Domini



LOOK IN THE ATTIC

ROSINE de BOUNEVIALLE examines the legacy of the Thatcher years

AMONG all the benefits so emphatically listed in Margaret Thatcher's tour-de-parliamentary-force during her Defence of the Reign Act, 1990, there were some very curious omissions. Her peroration that brought cheers from even the ranks of Tuscany and tears from even her Brutul assassins, contained no mention, much less a demand for reminiscent recognition, of the most positive and evident achievements of every Conservative administration from 1940 onwards - achievements sometimes initiated and always shared and endorsed by their alternating Socialist collaborators.

Perhaps that was the reason for the All-Party silence - the corrupt Satanic figure must remain locked in the attic like the portrait of Dorian Gray whilst the subject itself in its deceiving disguise dominated the stage, captivating players and understudies alike. If it seems unjust to include the Before-Thatcher era into the picture, remember that Bulldog Churchill and Super-Mac(millan) are the Tory gods whom it is blasphemy to deny.

Years Of Decline And Betrayal

1940 saw the contemporary "phoney" war turned into a conflict waged under the auspices of the United Nations. All our "blood, toil, tears and sweat" went to ensure that the Money Power won and the British people lost. Remember it. Winston Churchill claimed he had "not become the King's First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." That he did, and promoted European Union.

Super-Mac fanned the "wind of change" and took the first step to Europe via the Free Trade Area. Imperial Preference gave way to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). In Africa, with hurricane-speed, terrorism and witchcraft became once more the accepted way of precarious life. Common beggary became an integral part of the ex-colonial scene; debt the currency of the ex-imperialists.

Enoch Powell (remember it) opened the national gates to alien labour and waited until the flood appeared irreversible before he made his isolated "rivers of blood" speech. With the blasted Heath's "no loss of sovereignty" assurances was signed the Treaty of Rome. Hypocritical Harold Wilson "re-negotiated" us into the bonds he almost promised to loose. At last we arrive at the Thatcher era, and now at the end of it.

The packed House and the listening, looking millions heard that in eleven years the Conservatives had "rescued Britain from the parlous state to which Socialism had brought it." It seems Tory policies have brought "unparalleled prosperity to our citizens at home...and given power back to the people on an unprecedented scale." We were told there has been:

- * Power for more people to own their own houses (well, owe for them possibly, but that is the limit of the expansion in home-ownership).
- * Choice in public services, like which school, doctor or hospital to use (even if being brainwashed, waiting or queuing in the meantime).
- * A wonderful economic "recovery" involving a 10%-plus inflation rate

instead of 26%-plus.

- * Two million unemployed instead of four million (with the haemorrhaging of jobs in the heavy industries essential to our national sovereignty being stemmed by the gossamer bandage of transient posts in the so-called "service" industries).
- * Freedom, riches, health, happy lives for everyone - well, nearly everyone!

Thus, Margaret Thatcher and Douglas Hurd, Michael Heseltine and John Major, with not a dissent among them as to the desired goals - only competition as to who is to captain the side that kicks them.

Thatcher's Hidden, Hideous Portrait

Watching the euphoric performance on television and listening to comments on that performance and only on the subjects mentioned by the professional guides sticking to their briefs, it became a positive effort to remember all the atrocities that have resulted in the disease and corruption so detrimental to the body politic that its hideous portrait must be hidden lest its shocking aspect should call for the destruction of such barren stock.

Look in the attic. There you will find the true picture: a society wallowing in sentimental cruelty, racial and sexual adultery, lustful licence and legalised sodomy, having clamoured for and obtained the lawful right to murder the innocents, debauch children, corrupt families, condone capital crime, and finance the lot by usury. That is what is meant by Margaret Thatcher's multi-religious, multi-racial, non-discriminatory, God-forgetting, Christ-rejecting society. **NO ONE BOASTED OF THAT!**

A reader writes - "It would seem that Mrs Thatcher was doomed after her hesitation over the ERM issue. Some weeks ago she was summoned to a special meeting at Waddesdon Manor, recent home of the Rothschilds until they kindly gave it to the National Trust. On this and other special occasions, however, they borrowed it back in order to convene this conference at which Maggie was 'dressed-down' and put in her place over the European monetary system. The very next day, I think it was, she did her U-turn and it was announced that we were to join the ERM after all! The local press in Aylesbury got a whiff of the story, but the national press did not, I think, mention it. She was flown in by helicopter to avert any possible demonstration.

"Still stubborn, she has gone on to upset more Euro-fanatics until she got the Julius Caesar treatment. Or was it all a charade to let her out gracefully? Was she merely playing the role of a Kerenski to a pre-ordained Euro-Communism in grey suits? Struggling hard - but not too hard - to prevent the monetary rape which will, as I judge it, replace the Bank of England with a Federal Reserve Board in Brussels; the sequel, in fact, to the Federal Reserve Act which effectively shifted the fulcrum of High Finance from London to New York in 1913 - the year preceding the outbreak of World War One."

As ever more people become aware of the mysterious forces at work in the world causing universal confusion and chaos, invariably their questions are: "What is behind it all? Who is behind it all?" Only Candour endeavours to expose the conspiracy to dragoon mankind into a One World dictatorship. So spread our word - and secure more readers!

SADDAM IS NOT THE VILLAIN!

FRANK BROOKES looks behind the media hype about the new Devil Incarnate

SADDAM Hussein, the Iraqi leader, has been likened in the Anglo-American press to the 'Great Beast' of forty years ago, Adolf Hitler - and with probably the same injustice. As President Bush whips up hatred for Saddam in the name of Peace, making endless protestations that "we cannot tolerate aggression," he blandly ignores American aggression in Panama as he seeks to obtain United Nations "legitimation" for his colossal build-up of force in the Arab world. This, if anything, betrays the shameless hypocrisy of the whole UN set-up.

It is clear that it is not war that is evil, not aggression that must not be tolerated, but nationalism (excluding the Zionist strain, of course). Brutal killings, the take-over and interference with other peoples is quite all right and proper - so long as it is done in the name of the United Nations. Yet who are these "United Nations"? Nothing but a rag-bag of civilised and despotic governments largely, if not entirely, under the thumb of the money masters of the world whose real concern with the welfare of mankind is almost nil.

Humbug And Hypocrisy

Media portrayals of Saddam are mainly frenzied and frenetic hate-pieces drummed up to encourage political innocents to acquiesce in the slaughter of Anglo-Saxon manhood on a soil where they have no right to be and in a cause more Zionist than American or British. After the killing and maiming of Britons in six years of bloody warfare to "save Poland" the whole world knows that all that resulted from the carnage was the destruction of Europe, the loss of the British Empire and the worse slavery than before of the very nation in whose cause it all supposedly happened.

From whence comes all this hatred for Iraq and encouragement of Anglo-Saxon militarism in what is, after all, the heart of the Arab world? Iraq's Catholic Patriarch Raphael I Bidawid has no doubt! "The Press is all in the pay of Israel and the United States," he said in an interview with the Catholic current affairs magazine, **Thirty Days**.

Tearing to shreds the propaganda that presents Saddam Hussein as an evil and aggressive monster, the Patriarch, who actually knows the Iraqi leader far better than President Bush or any other Western figure, and certainly far better than the leader-writers and bought scribblers of the Western media, says, "Saddam is certainly no Saint, but he is the best politician we have had to date....He has been generous with all citizens and with all religions. The real monster is not Saddam but the mass media that depicts him as such. All the fuss in the newspapers serves Israel's cause. The one country that worries Israel is Iraq because all the others are in subjection to Israel....As for the international blockade, I would like to recall how no one raised a finger when Israel attacked the Iraqi nuclear power plant."

This last statement typifies Anglo-American hypocrisy in world politics. Just as they ignored Poland's sabre-rattling stance in 1939 and Polish brutalities towards German minorities, so they turn a blind

eye to Israeli aggression and Israeli cruelties in order to bring pressure to bear on an Arab leader whom they dislike with an intensity amounting to hatred. We must do all that we can to impress upon our political leaders that we, at least, are not prepared to be brainwashed into accepting the crazy idea that it is necessary for Peace and Justice that British blood should be wasted in the deserts in what is really a Zionist rather than a Western quarrel. We are not prepared to tolerate a situation where Israel will die to the last Anglo-Saxon to bring down Saddam Hussein, and we should tell our Members of Parliament just how strongly we feel about this.

A final quotation from Patriarch Bidawid should also be borne in mind. "You Westerners know nothing of Arabs. The Arabs are a people who would give their lives in defence of honour. I am sure American parents are not willing to sacrifice their children for a cause they do not understand." The same applies to us.

OILING THE WHEELS OF WAR

"FROM secret service circles it is reported that the West German government, under pressure from the USA, concluded a secret agreement with Israel in January 1990 whereby the Howaldtswerke Shipyards Company Ltd in Kiel would build two 'strategic' submarines for Israel for the sum of one billion dollars. These submarines would be finished by 1992 and will be capable of launching chemical and nuclear weapons against Iraq. The Iraqi ruler, Saddam Hussein, got wind of this agreement and began to prepare himself militarily for the coming war with Israel.

"Meanwhile, the American and British governments put pressure on Kuwait to export oil in such great quantities that the world market price of oil plunged to \$12 a barrel, thereby causing Baghdad a \$15 billion per annum loss in revenue. This would destroy Iraq's ability to acquire any further modern weaponry. When the Iraqi secret service saw through both the Israeli war preparations and the Anglo-American-Zionist plot, Saddam Hussein decided to annex Kuwait in order to staunch the over-production of oil and aim at a more equitable price for his own oil."

[With acknowledgement to **The Insider**, PO Box 17200, Gloenkloof, Pretoria 0027, South Africa.]

*

"The **New York Times** of September 23rd reported that US Ambassador April Glaspie led Iraq President Saddam Hussein to believe that the US could 'live with' a limited invasion of Kuwait. The Rumalia oil field is one of the largest in the world. Kuwait sits on only 10% of this oil deposit, yet they and British Petroleum Oil have been draining 50% of the oil....Thus this is a legitimate bone of contention for Hussein.

"The **New York Times** article says that our government led Hussein to believe that he could move his forces 20 miles across the border and seize the rest of this oil field. Then the US would not be upset enough to take any action over such a minor 'take back'."

[With acknowledgement to **The Truth At Last**, PO Box 1211, Marietta, Georgia 30061, United States of America.]

CUT AND THRUST

JANUS offers candid comment on news from home and abroad

AMONG 26 men and women arrested after anti-poll tax riots in Brixton were two Dutchmen, an unemployed Frenchman "visiting" from Paris, two men from Southern Ireland and an Italian pavement artist, the last one holding a degree in the history of art and currently squatting in Brixton. Ignoring the question of how those who are unemployed manage to find enough money to travel abroad, it would seem that many of those involved in the riots do not pay any poll tax at all. Presumably they are filled with moral indignation and any suggestion that they are being paid, or are merely looking for trouble, can be ignored.

*

*

*

*

A LETTER in the **Daily Telegraph** draws attention to the new signs on Ordnance Survey maps showing places of worship (no longer designated "churches" or "chapels"). These now denote "with or without spire, minaret or dome." The OS claim that a cross is merely a conventional sign and does not necessarily apply to a Christian church. I can foresee trouble when our non-Christian religious leaders realise that a church, mosque, temple and presumably synagogue are all lumped together. Salman Rushdie will soon be forgotten in the ensuing row!

*

*

*

*

THE Chairman of the Burton Group, Sir Ralph Halpen, is leaving with a golden handshake of £2 million and a pension of £456,000 per annum. The group reported a thirty per cent drop in profits and a cut in dividend payments in its latest report to shareholders. I wonder how much he would have received had the company been making a healthy profit?

*

*

*

*

SOME time ago I suggested, sarcastically, that child sex might be made legal in the future on the grounds that children mature (or are alleged to) at an earlier age than in the past. This has now come to pass. The age of "consent" in Holland is to be lowered to twelve on the grounds that children are more mature, blah, blah, and also because they "do it" anyway and society must conform to reality, so to speak. As to this second point, plenty of children go shoplifting; should this, therefore, cease to be a crime? Will we see advertisements urging us, or some of us, to have a weekend break in Holland, accompanied by a young friend? The expression "Going Dutch" may well considerably change its meaning in the future.

*

*

*

*

A MOSLEM lawyer in Pakistan has convinced the country's Shariat Court that the penalty for expressing contempt of the Prophet Mohammed should be death. If we have what will be, in effect, a separate Moslem administration in this country (as has been suggested), how will this conflict with the present ruling by our masters in Brussels that the death penalty is cruel and inhuman and should not be used? No doubt a compromise will be reached by which only a Moslem may perform the sentence. This will be in keeping with the present system by which

abattoirs must obey certain rules when slaughtering animals - unless it is done for religious reasons, when any amount of suffering is then endured by the helpless creatures.

*

*

*

*

THERE are as many pigs in Holland as there are people. The result, or by-product, of the pigs is a 15 million ton surplus of pig manure. The Dutch plan to turn this excess into golfball-sized pellets (which would presumably be free from unpleasant smells). However, the European Community's competition directorate, run by Sir Leon Brittan, is raising objections. Soon, Sir Leon is expected to tell Holland to cut back its plans or face prosecution. The reason? This could constitute an illegal state aid for farmers. More importantly, his department is upset lest the heavily-subsidised pellets undercut chemical fertilisers, such as those made by ICI. Did someone say the whole thing stinks?

*

*

*

*

UGANDA has invaded Rwanda and there is fighting between the Tutsi and Hutu tribes. People demonstrating in New Delhi about reserving jobs for low caste Indians have been killed in the rioting. A curfew in Kashmir with 48 dead and injured in riots. Religious riots in Uttar Pradesh caused 26 deaths. In Papua New Guinea 19 rebels have been killed. More fighting is imminent in Cambodia. The Punjab is under central government rule and 2,400 people have been killed this year. How nice to think that with the removal of Imperialist and Colonial tyranny the free peoples are happy and prosperous in this new, democratic world.

*

*

*

*

LVKO Lukyanenko, a Ukrainian who spent 26 years in a Gulag, has been described as a "Ukrainian Mandela." I should imagine that this gives him excellent grounds for an action for slander and heavy damages.

*

*

*

*

UNDER an EC regulation, all jam must be made from fruit, but in Portugal they make jam from carrots and sweet potatoes. As even the EC cannot (yet) forbid the making of carrot jam they have devised an ingenious solution: in future, carrots are fruit. My first reaction is to laugh at such nonsense, but on second thoughts it seems not to be so funny after all. As we become more and more enmeshed in the bureaucratic toils of the EC we shall have more and more petty regulations. Some will be merely silly, time-consuming and expensive; some will be thoroughly bad, such as those dealing with the export of live animals to the Continent. Those which would be beneficial, such as cleaning up beaches, concern matters which we should tackle ourselves, without having to be told. If our present system of government is incompetent, then let us have a change of system - not wait until we are given orders, as if we were children.

*

*

*

*

THE left wing council of Prewton refused to accept a charity cheque for £2,000 for a children's hospital because the money was donated by the crew of a nuclear submarine. Someone should explain to the bloody fools that the cheque is not radio-active!

WHEN THE PARTY WITHERS AWAY

ANTHONY COONEY considers why the Communist system is collapsing

HOW could Communism, its control seemingly complete and comprehensive, collapse so suddenly? The general reaction has been relief, amazement, jubilation, but so it was when Chamberlain returned from Munich. Among Social Creditors and others of similar philosophy, there has been suspicion. Is this the next to last move of a Chess-Master making an offer his opponent cannot refuse? The late Hamish Fraser said that the Communists were lucky rather than masterly. Those who fear that the Communist strategy of "two steps forward, one step back" makes its victory inevitable have, in part at least, accepted Marxist dialectic. Why should we suppose that Communism cannot be prevented from taking its step forward?

We have also accepted Communism's assessment of itself. We believed that the Marxist formation of its apparatchiks was too thorough, the party technique of "criticism and self-criticism" too searching, and the sanction of State and Party terror too pervasive for there to be organised crime in Communist states, much less for there to be corrupt policemen and party members. The ball-carriers for Communism in the media reinforced this belief. One "expert" on Communism, a **News Chronicle** columnist, returned from a grand tour of the Iron Curtain countries in August 1956 to assert that there were no petty criminals and no prostitutes in Moscow and that life in Budapest was care-free and cultured. A few weeks later the Hungarian uprising began.

Viewpoint Of An Economist

Still we are left groping for an explanation. How could something so monolithic, so buttressed against opposition, collapse so suddenly? Roger Boyes' book * offers an economist's explanation. Boyes is a social democrat in the European sense. He hopes that something of socialism - "market socialism" - may be saved from the wreck, though the evidence of the wreck he presents ought not to make him optimistic. His book, subtitled "Gorbachev, the Underworld and the Rebirth of Capitalism," is not an academic treatise; it is a journalist's book, in journalist's prose.

He presents his argument in the first part and then supports it with a series of pen-portraits of people he has met as a correspondent in the Soviet bloc for the past ten years. There is the honest policeman who is threatened by his fellow policemen for trying to end bribery and then arrested by his superiors and sent to prison for not heeding the warning. There is the ruthless "Godfather" who first organised his "mob" among the criminal elements of the Gulag and upon his release transplanted his empire into the world outside. There are the pitiful prostitutes and an interesting sidelight upon the UNO. Soviet bloc countries, having signed the UN "Abolition Act" of 1952 which bans "the penalization or compulsory control of prostitution," are unable to ban these females from hotel foyers. One wonders if the UNO worshippers in the Catholic Justice and Peace Commissions know this?

Boyes' explanation of the sudden collapse may be summarised thus. The collapse was not sudden. Its seeds lay in Communism from the start. For the Communist state "The Plan" is all important, but the Plan cannot

work. The market responds to and is served by the myriad free decisions and arbitrary choices of numberless individuals. It is true that the general trends and effects of these choices, given a sufficient "mass," can be plotted by actuarial science, but they cannot be planned for in advance and no central plan can replicate them. In effect, the Plan creates shortages of everything.

First, impossibly high targets are set. Factory and farm managements falsify their returns to show that they have over-fulfilled their quotas. Factory managers hoard components against possible future need, so the next stage of manufacture is disrupted for lack of components. Goods which the Plan asserts are in the shops have not even been made. The breakdown would have come even sooner if it were not for that epiphenomenon of planning and socialism, the Spiv. The "Tolkachi" knows where things are being hoarded. He travels between factories bribing their release; where that fails he visits the black market which satisfies the demand by stealing the supply, either from the factories or from the transport system. In short, the Plan, the essence of Communism, criminalises society.

Shortages From The Cradle To The Grave

The necessary corruption of the production and distribution networks is only a fragment of the picture. The Plan criminalises the consumer, and does so from the cradle to the grave. Neither maternity wards nor crematoria are exempt from the shortages created by the Plan, and people must bribe or be bribed to give birth or dispose of their dead on time! Even in the one case where the Plan appears successful, the production of tractors, the law that people will always do what is easiest defeats Communism. The USSR produces 4.5 times as many tractors as the USA, although it has less tillable land, but with state subsidy the collective farms find it easier to buy new tractors than to repair the old. Consequently, there is always a waiting list for tractors.

Communism has criminalized society, but particularly the Party and the police. The black market may provide the things people need to live, and therefore be tolerated, but it creates an economy which is outwith the control of the Party, and the Party begins to decay. By the 1980s it had lost control, but still bore responsibility.

The Left, particularly the New Left and the old Left of Trotsky, make strenuous efforts to disentangle Marxism from Stalinism. The truth is that the alternative market which Communism makes necessary and which has destroyed Communism, antedates Stalin. It is at least arguable that it was only the Stalinist terror which shored up the fallacies of Marxism for so long. In the same way the press have made much of the fact that Gorbachev is now invested with more power than any previous Communist leader. More power than Stalin? It is difficult to believe, but there is a difference. Stalin's absolute power was derived from his office of General Secretary of the Communist Party. Gorbachev's new power derives from that now invested in the Head of State. It is constitutional power, and this is the culmination of the revolution against Communism. It is not the State which has withered away, but the Party.

And yet Boyes' book only supplies the contemporary evidence for the truth of what we knew but did not dare to hope. Over two thousand years ago Aristotle, in his criticism of Plato's communist **Republic**, stated: "There is a further drawback to common ownership: the greater the

number of owners, the less respect for the property....They exercise care over public property only in so far as they are personally affected. Other reasons apart, the thought that someone else is looking after it tends to make them careless of it." [The Politics: Bk II Ch 3] A point amply borne out by the case of the collective farms and the tractors!

"Again, it would be only fair to count not merely the evils of which property-sharing would rid us, but also the advantages of which it would deprive us. Such a count would show that to live in the way suggested would be really impossible. The cause of Socrates' error lies in his false premise about unity....It is as if one were to reduce harmony to unison or rhythm to a single beat....There is another point that ought not to be overlooked; the immense period of time during which this form of communism has remained undiscovered, as it surely would not have remained had it been really good?....The force of our arguments about unity would become clearer if we could see a Platonic city actually being put together." [The Politics: Bk II Ch 5]

We have seen it; and we know that it does not work!

The Example Of The Golden Sovereign

C.H. Douglas, however, has provided a more recent critique, and it is the more germane since it is directed at "The Plan." Douglas' defence of the market against the Planners is best understood from his vivid illustration of the golden sovereign. When a man entered a shop and requested an item from the shelf, proffering a sovereign as effective demand, he immediately set in motion an Order for the item to be replaced on the shelf. On receipt of that Order, carters carted, factory workers set machines in motion, ships sailed, farmers sowed and reaped, miners mined and quarrymen quarried. The only weakness in the system was that not enough people had sovereigns with which to command, and for that Social Credit proposed a remedy.

No centralised Marxist or Fabian "Plan" can provide for all the free actions necessary to replace the item on the shelf. This is because, as Douglas argued in **Social Credit**, Plans are static - Platonic abstractions - whilst Society is dynamic. By the time the minutiae of The Plan have been gathered, society has moved on to new situations; a fact which defeated Labour's "National Plan" in 1969. The Plan is an Ideal Form so that even in Platonic terms actuality can never be identical to it.

The entire argument of Boyes' book may indeed be summarized by a quotation from Douglas' monograph, **The Big Idea**: "The idea so skilfully inculcated that confiscation of property will assist in the distribution of wealth is, of course, completely without foundation. Socialism is a restriction system...and it has two well-defined fundamental principles - centralisation of power and espionage....It has no chance whatever of success, but it has a real chance of setting back the clock of human happiness by hundreds of years."

What Douglas prophesied, Boyes has testified has happened.

* **The Hard Road To Market**, Roger Boyes, Secker and Warburg. Hardback, 322 pp + index, £17.99.

FOR SELLING OURSELVES DOWN THE RIVER, HAVE WE ASKED A FAIR PRICE?

MATTHEW ARMITAGE sets a price on the scuttle from Empire

THE Russians aren't known for their business acumen. A nation which is now bleating for help from the West can hardly be said to be bright in the business sense. But one recent comment suggests there may be some hope for them. When the Lithuanians started agitating for independence earlier this year the Russians demanded compensation for the millions of pounds of assets poured into Lithuania over the past forty years.

In the same period of time the British Empire was broken up. Countries which were developed at the expense of the British people were handed over to native peoples without any compensation at all. Indeed, many of these countries still receive "foreign aid" from us. It could be argued that some of the former imperial territories supplied food and raw materials to the British economy for years, so this might compensate to some extent for the assets we left when we granted them "independence." In the case of the White Commonwealth, these countries have largely built up their economies by their own efforts, their people being our descendants.

Irish Inventory

The one nation in the old Empire that was more of a liability than an asset was Ireland. When in 1922 the British government gave Home Rule to twenty six counties, millions of pounds' worth of assets paid for by the British taxpayer were handed over. Then since the 1960s Irish republicans have launched a vicious campaign to get the remaining six counties of Ulster ceded to Dublin. Naturally, nothing is said about compensating Britain for the land, buildings and industrial plants of Ulster. All these must be worth billions of pounds and the Republic almost certainly couldn't afford it. One way of silencing the clamour for pulling out of the North would be quite simply to put a fair price on the province. Dublin could also be asked to pay for the resettlement of any members of the Protestant majority who would undoubtedly want to escape from the clutches of the Republic.

Further afield and no less under threat from avaricious eyes is Gibraltar. The Rock was captured from Spain in 1704 - won by conquest. For many years now the Spanish have been agitating for its return. How much is it worth? Would the Spanish be prepared to pay for it?

Argentinians desired the Falkland Islands so much that they were prepared to fight for them. But how much would they be prepared to pay? The Islands must be worth many millions by themselves, particularly in view of their proximity to possible oil deposits. On top of this we must add their commercial value as an anchorage; there is also the sheep farming; and what about the fisheries? There is no doubt that many of the Islanders would want to re-locate in the event of an Argentinian take-over. Would the Argies help them out financially?

We are handing over Hong Kong to China in 1997. Is there going to be any compensation paid by the Chinese for the assets we will be giving away? If not, is it too late to ask? It is about time that we became a little more commercially minded over the assets that our ancestors acquired by their skills and courage.

CHESTERTON AND MOSLEY

JEFFREY HAMM contrasts the records of two great patriots

THE spirit of A.K. Chesterton has inspired **Candour** to survive when so many "little magazines" have fallen victim to Mrs Thatcher's "market forces." Those who came to disagree with his opinions never doubted his honesty and integrity. They were puzzled, however, by what they regarded as inconsistencies in the logical processes of his first-class mind.

In the 'thirties Chesterton was perhaps best known for his membership of the British Union of Fascists and his authorship of the biography of Sir Oswald Mosley, **Portrait Of A Leader**. The book loudly sang Mosley's praises; indeed, some ardent Mosley admirers felt it bordered on fulsome flattery. Why, then, did he not follow his "leader," firstly into some prison or internment camp under the infamous wartime Defence Regulation 18B and later into Mosley's post-war Union Movement?

Formative Years

Although **Portrait Of A Leader** was largely devoted to the Mosley of his Fascist era, it dealt briefly with the pre-Fascist years. Mosley wrote at length of these years in his autobiography, **My Life**, and I have always argued that they are highly relevant to an understanding of his later years. In my book, **The Evil Good Men Do**, I quoted from Mosley's first election address as a Conservative candidate in Harrow at the end of the First World War; an address which advocated "great schemes of social reform and ruthless Socialist measures." The Birmingham Proposals, Mosley Memorandum and Mosley Manifesto of his Labour Party days developed these themes and they formed the basis of the British Union. (It was illogical for members of the Birmingham Labour Party who had applauded their hero "Tom" Mosley in the city's Town Hall on 3 May 1925 to join the mob in wrecking Mosley's New Party in the Rag Market in 1931). As a Conservative, Independent, junior Labour Minister, and leader of the New Party and British Union, Mosley pursued policies for logical consistency.

Let us revert to the first question posed above: why did Chesterton not join Mosley in wartime internment? The answer is simple: although many members of British Union served with distinction in the Second World War, often before or after internment, and in many cases gave their lives, the overwhelming majority opposed war as not in the interest of Britain. Chesterton, who had already left British Union, took another view: that Hitler's Germany constituted a threat to the British Empire. It was with deep sorrow he came to realise that the war had, in fact, destroyed the Empire and substituted a so-called "Commonwealth." Old friends of Chesterton felt he was indulging in nostalgia when he founded the League of Empire Loyalists and wondered how one could be loyal to an Empire which (sadly) no longer existed.

It was this admirable if misplaced loyalty to the old Empire which deterred Chesterton from joining Mosley's post-war Union Movement, with its advocacy of a truly united Europe. I would argue that the advance from British Union to Union Movement was the only logical course Mosley could have adopted and was consistent with all his pre-war thinking. The economic policies of British Union had been based upon the development of the Empire as a self-contained viable unit, insulated

against the machinations of international finance seeking to flood it with the cut-price produce of sweated labour. The "new Empire" to replace the old should be united Europe.

A number of pre-war concepts had been destroyed as a result of the war. For example, it had been an admirable part of British Union policy to purchase from Australia food which could not be grown in Britain, in exchange for our manufactured goods. The war had led to considerable industrialisation in Australia, which could now produce much of the manufactured goods previously bought from Britain - or purchase them more cheaply from countries which could provide a larger market than Britain for her agricultural produce. The whole basis of British Union economic policy had been destroyed.

If this economic argument is conceded, there remains a powerful emotional appeal which cannot be underrated. It is an appeal for loyalty to our kith and kin in the White Commonwealth; a concept at which the Left sneers, but one highly regarded by true nationalists and patriots. There are complications, however, in the high proportion of non-British immigrants into post-war Australia and New Zealand, and the friction between British and French in Canada. Has the kith and kin concept been destroyed for ever, or may it flourish anew on a European basis? It was part of Mosley's post-war "vision splendid" to advocate the extension of united Europe to include "Europe overseas," i.e. the above former Dominions, South Africa and all southern Africa which then lay under European rule, before its unhappy inhabitants were "liberated" and handed over to Marxist one-party dictatorship. Such a concept would have created a great "third force" in the world between capitalist America and the communist bloc, with a population of 400 million - almost equal to that of America and Russia combined.

Implications For Sovereignty

But would not such a concept entail a surrender of Britain's national sovereignty? My first comment is that this admirable commodity is not clearly visible to the naked eye in a world dominated by international finance, in which the old adage still rings true: "When Wall Street sneezes, the City of London catches influenza." (I have often quoted Attlee's protest at the time of Britain's first post-war devaluation of the pound - from \$4.20 to \$2.80 - in 1949: this was not the fault of the Labour government, but was due to "external factors." Exactly! Mosley told the Labour leaders that when he joined their party in 1924.)

Mosley advocated a European government for the defence of our continent and the leadership of its economy. He proposed the retention of national governments for internal affairs, and a third tier of regional governments for local matters and for the preservation of the diverse ancient languages and cultures of Europe. His concept was the logical development of forces long at work. Not many years ago (in historical terms) Lancashire and Yorkshire were engaged in the bitter Wars of the Roses. When I lived in Manchester I frequently travelled over the Pennines into Yorkshire, and back again. I was never required to show my passport or change my Lancashire francs into Yorkshire marks, and I have never heard of a balance of payments problem between the two counties. Yet the men of Lancashire and Yorkshire have lost none of their identity or "sovereignty." They still fight, but with cricket bats at Old Trafford or Headingley, rather than on the battlefield. I belong to neither of those great counties, for I was born in Wales, of

a Welsh mother and an English father. What does that make me? The Bishop of the Falkland Islands, whom I met there before my wartime arrest and internment, answered that rhetorical question with the words: "Neither fish, flesh nor fowl!" I would give another answer. Firstly, with respect to other peoples, I know what I am not. I am not an African, an American or an Asian. I am a European, in common with readers of **Candour**.

Some of those readers will find this article highly controversial. I look forward to their comments, to their slings and arrows. Let the debate commence!

*** Jeffrey Hamm was secretary to Sir Oswald Mosley for many years prior, to Mosley's death in December 1980. His autobiography, **Action Replay**, was published in 1983 and his second book, **The Evil Good Men Do**, in 1988. Under the pen-name Geoffrey Vernon, he edits the quarterly magazine, **Lodestar**. All the above, and a complete booklist, may be obtained upon request from Sanctuary Press, Nash House, Fishponds Road, London SW17.

WHEN HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

BRIAN CAMERON investigates the background to the Exodus of 1290

NOVEMBER 1st saw the 700th anniversary of the Edict of Expulsion by which King Edward I expelled the Jews from England. Whilst this event in history has been omitted from our educational curriculum, it is openly discussed in books of Jewish history. For example, in Joan Comay's **Who's Who in Jewish History After The Old Testament** (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1974), the entry for Edward I reads:

"On 18th July, 1290, he declared that all Jews must leave England by 1st November of that year. As a pious ruler he wanted the expulsion to be humane. The Wardens of the Cinque Ports were to supervise the departure of the Jews and see that the poor were able to obtain cheap tickets and that no man was allowed to 'injure, harm, damage or grieve' them. They were to be allowed to take with them all their cash and personal property...."

It might seem strange to some that the writer is so candid about this event. Another aspect of the Edict of Expulsion that the writer does not hide is that apparently it has never been rescinded. Under the entry for Rabbi Manasseh ben Israel we read that he "spent much of his life trying to find new places where the Jews might settle.... In 1650 he published **The Hope of Israel**.... The work...sparked off discussion on the possibility of the return of the Jews to England. In Manasseh's view this would fulfil messianic prophecy. He therefore saw the success of the Puritan cause in England as a hopeful sign. He sent a petition to the Council of State in London."

Comay goes on to state that Cromwell favoured the petition for practical rather than messianic reasons and invited Manasseh to England. "On 31st October, 1655, he appeared before the Council of State, laying stress on the economic and social advantages to be gained by the English from the re-admission of the Jews. A conference on the

subject was convened but was dissolved by Cromwell, who bowed to popular pressure when opposition became manifest.... Manasseh returned to Holland in October 1657, deeply distressed at what he considered the failure of his mission.... Although Edward I's Edict of Expulsion was not formally revoked as Manasseh had hoped, the permitted resumption of open Jewish worship achieved the same practical result although the Edict has not been revoked to this day."

Edward I's expulsion was not an isolated incident in the Jews' diasporic history. They were expelled from Jerusalem by the Romans from 70 AD; from Spain in the seventh century and again in 1492; from the Moorish Kingdom of Granada in 1066; from France in 1182, 1306, 1394 and 1682. They were expelled from Germany in the 10th century AD by a decree of Pope Leo VII; from the Rhineland in 1012; from Bavaria in 1276 and 1551, and again from the whole of Germany in 1319. They were expelled from Hungary in 1360 and 1582; from Belgium in 1370; from Austria in 1420 and 1670; from Lithuania in 1495; from Portugal in 1498; from Prussia in 1510; from the Kingdom of Naples in 1510; from the Genoese Republic in 1567; from the Papal States in 1569 and 1599. They were then expelled from Russia by Czar Nicholas II at the turn of this century. It is seen, therefore, that ours is not the only age to bear witness to remarkable powers of survival. No secret is made of these expulsions; rather, they are adduced as proof of unvarying anti-semitism of every Christian community from AD 70 onwards. Wasn't there something about "whited sepulchres"?

The Sin Of Usury

What were the reasons for Edward I's Edict of Expulsion? When his father, Henry III, died in 1272, Edward was in the Holy Land on Crusade against the Saracens. When he returned to England as king, he found his country facing financial crisis. Seeking an explanation for this state of affairs, he turned to Pope Gregory X, who that year had called the Second Council of Lyons. This had expatiated on the sin of usury, condemning the usurers whether they were native or foreign. Having investigated the situation here, Edward believed that the practice of usury was monopolised by Jews. So in 1275, the Statutum de Judeismo was promulgated by the Common Council of the Realm at Westminster.

Edward, as a faithful Christian must, tried proselytising. He thought that if Jews could be assimilated into the economic life of the country by being turned from moneylenders into what he considered to be legal merchants competing with Christians, they might one day convert to Christianity and become integrated into society. The King believed that their conversion "to the Catholic faith would specially lead to the increase of faith and worship of the name of Christ." However, inflation in 1278 and 1279 compelled Edward to renew his coinage and inquiries into its state - there were many accusations of clipping - laid blame on the Jews. Expulsion had never been high on Edward's agenda, but as relations between Christian and Jew went from bad to worse, he came to the conclusion that removal was the only remedy.

Royal greed and economic envy have been cited as factors that led to Edward I's decision. Certainly Parliament granted him a fifteenth as a thank offering. But as Professor T.F. Tout remarked in his biography, **Edward The First** (Macmillan & Co., 1901), "The King himself was a heavy loser by the transaction and was thought to have shown rare unselfishness and high religious principle."

GOLDILOCKS AND THE THREE DARES

Dare Number-One was oh such fun,
Had the Commons agog and aghast
Goldilocks in disgrace
As he brandished the Mace
And gave Labour a verbal lambaste.

Then in Defence, a Minister hence,
A gamble to hit or to bust
With the Westland affair
He took leave of his share
Governmentally, Backbenchwise
was thrust.

Ultimately he conjured Number-
Three
The dare to unseat the P.M.
And to claim only he
Was the fit one to be
At the top and inside "No. 10."

But fate came unkind, his Mates
were purblind
Tho' the lady went out on her ear
And a Major upset
Plans of Goldilocks yet
He got boxed in the Cabinet's
bier.

True Tory spite puts Goldilocks
right
Where the stink of a skunk would
smell sweet
'Tis his job to unroll
The impossible Poll
Or to serve up a Tory defeat.

The bowl put to soak, the chair
so broke;
Ambition's bed all rumpled and
unmade,
Three mishaps to bear,
A chase to nowhere
For Heseltine of the Goldilocks
shade.

B.E. BIGGS

OPEN SESAME is an anthology of the poems of B.E. Biggs. Only £1 from Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

TAPES FROM FOREST HOUSE - If it's Truth you want, it's Candour Tapes you need! Send an s.a.e. for our latest list of cassettes featuring the voices of past patriots.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

MADAM - The most glaring recent example of hypocrisy is the proposals to fine shopkeepers up to £2000 for selling tobacco products to persons under 16. Yet the same politicians are making contraceptives freely available to underage persons, without even their parents' knowledge, let alone their consent.

Then there is all the maudlin publicity for the annual "Children In Need" appeal. Not one brass farthing of those millions will be dispersed to finance the fight against abortion. All the pro-life movements are desperately short of cash.

TED ATKINSON

EDITOR'S NOTE

THE Editor says "sorry" to anyone who expected a "little note" with our October issue and did not even get "the back of an envelope." The lapse was due to the coincidence of an eye operation (successful, God be thanked) and the despatch of **Candour**. So please forgive her. She hopes to be back to her idiosyncratic normal self in the New Year.

The Editor and staff wish every reader a Happy and Holy Christmas and a Right New Year.

Read **SPEARHEAD**. Edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the B.N.P. Sample copy 80p from PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £8 OVERSEAS £10
U.S. \$20 AIRMAIL

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Co., Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD.
[Editor: Rosine de Bouneville]